

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Applicant thanks the Examiner for taking the time to conduct a telephone interview on February 23, 2005. Claims 12-22 have been rejected. Claims 12, 14-16, and 18 have been amended. Claim 13 has been canceled. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the application in view of the amendments and following remarks submitted in support thereof.

**Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph**

The Examiner rejected claims 12 and 14-22 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter. Specifically, the Examiner noted that the scope of the claims were not clear, and that the previously identified excerpts failed to explain the defined terms. As suggested by the Examiner during the telephone interview, the Applicant has amended independent claims 12 and 18 to further clarify that a resource adapter collaborates to provide connections with one of a plurality of application servers and an enterprise information system (EIS), which provides services offered by the EIS. The deployment of the resource adapter has been further defined to include configuring the resource adapter in a target operational environment to create a connection to an instance of the EIS, whereby the connections of the target operational environment is defined between one of the application servers and the EIS.

Furthermore, the Applicant has amended independent claim 18 to further clarify that the system includes a processor that executes a connector provider and a deployer stored in memory. Applicant additionally amended claims 14-16 to further provide explicit antecedent basis for a few terms defined in the claims. The Applicant believes that the amendments as agreed to and suggested by the Examiner, in view of the previously presented, detailed

mapping of the claims (see Request for Reconsideration mailed December 6, 2004), have clarified the scope of the claims such that the amended claims particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph rejection.

**Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, First Paragraph**

The Examiner rejected claims 12 and 14-22 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to make and to use the invention. As discussed during the telephone interview, in view of the previously submitted, detailed mapping of the claims to the specification (see Request for Reconsideration mailed December 6, 2004) and the amendments that further clarify the claims, the Applicant submits that claims 12 and 14-22 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph because the above-referenced terms defined in claims 12 and 14-22 have clear support in the description, with exemplary source code, such that one skilled in the art can easily make and use the claimed invention without undue experimentation. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph rejection.

**Anticipation Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) and Obviousness Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

The Examiner has rejected independent claims 12 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,687,745 to Franco et al. Furthermore, dependent claims 14-17 and 19-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Franco et al. in view of what is well known in the art. In view of the amendments that further clarify the scope of the claims, the Applicant submits that the Examiner's interpretation of the claims is simply too broad in view of the specification. For detailed explanations on the

anticipation and obviousness rejections, the Applicant directs the Examiner to the previously submitted remarks/arguments in the Request for Reconsideration mailed December 6, 2004. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) and 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejections.

**Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, the Applicant respectfully submits that all the pending claims 12 and 14-22 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions concerning the present request, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at (408) 774-6924. If any additional fees are due in connection with filing this request, the Commissioner is also authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 50-0805 (Order No. SUNMP148). A duplicate copy of the transmittal is enclosed for this purpose.

Respectfully submitted,  
MARTINE & PENILLA, L.L.P.



Michael K. Hsu, Esq.  
Reg. No. 46,782

Martine Penilla & Gencarella, LLP  
710 Lakeway Drive, Suite 200  
Sunnyvale, California 94085  
Telephone: (408) 774-6924  
**Customer Number 32,291**